



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/496,231	02/01/2000	Jeffrey A. Hubbell	50154/002002	5903

7590 06/04/2002
Kristina Bieker-Brady
Clark & Elbing LLP
176 Federal Street
Boston, MA 02110

EXAMINER

LANKFORD JR, LEON B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1651

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2002

18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Washington, D.C. 20231

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

18

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

The reply filed on 3-4-02 is not fully responsive to the prior Office action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): applicant did not elect a specific species. The election of species requirement was intended to require specific components, i.e. compounds, not functional groups. Applicant is required to elect specific components not functional groups or classes of compounds. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be bona fide, applicant is given a TIME PERIOD of ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Applicant is invited to amend the claims when responding to this paper. The current claims are somewhat confusing and it should be noted that the generic claims, as written, appear to read on a myriad of well known nucleophilic addition reactions. Applicant is invited to more clearly claim applicant's invention or point out why the instant claims differ from old and well known nucleophilic reactions. The examiner feels this will expedite prosecution and the identification of potential allowable subject matter.

L Blaine Lankford
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1651